REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12 are pending in the application.

By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 10 are amended. Claim 11 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 12 is added.

Claim 1 is amended to better define the present invention relative to the prior art. Claims 2 and 3 are amended for better conformity with claim 1. Claim 2 also is amended to delete the word "particularly." Claims 4, 7, and 8 are amended to delete the expression "and/or." Claims 4 and 10 are amended to correct a lack of antecedent basis. The dependency of claim 7 is amended to correct a lack of antecedent basis.

These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Objections to the Claims

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 2, 4, 7, 8, and 11 were objected to due to various informalities. The objections to claims 2, 4, 7, and 8 are believed to be overcome by the above amendments. The objection to claim 11 is overcome by its cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-11 were rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by Wallace. This rejection is believed to be overcome by the amendments to claim 1.

As recited in amended claim 1, the present invention is directed to a telescopable boring rod mechanism with at least two mutually displaceable Kelly rods adjacent to each other, which are equipped with means for transmitting a torque to the adjacent Kelly rod. At least one of the Kelly rods is constructed from at least two rod segments, which are made from a different material, wherein one rod segment is made from a steel material and the other rod segment is made from a lightweight construction material. The rod segment made from the lightweight construction material is firmly connected to the rod segment made from the steel material and has a sufficient torsional stiffness for permitting torque transmission.

With reference to Figure 1, Wallace discloses a drill string 6 having a well tool 12 interposed therein above the lower drill string 7 (column 2, line 52 - column 3, line 4 and column 3, lines 68-73). Wallace's apparatus "provides for a pre-determined weight on the drill string [6] by interposing the present weight tool [12] at a pre-determined point above the bit in the drill string, and which will only permit drilling for a pre-determined distance. Any additional weight of the drill string above the tool is precluded from the drill bit, since the tool [12] provides for a stoppage of drilling when subjected to additional weight." Column 1, lines 37-45. Thus, it is questionable whether the tool 12 can itself be considered a Kelly rod in the sense of the present invention.

Referring to Figures 2-7 and column 3, lines 5-41 of Wallace, the tool 12 is connected to the drill string 6 by upper and lower threaded connections. The tool 14 is provided with peripheral

splines 14, which cooperate with mating internal splines 54 in a drive collar 52. Within drive collar 52 is placed a rubber packing collar 62 (column 4, line 3), the purpose of which is to seal off the drilling fluid from the lower end of the housing 38 and to assure that the flow direction is through the bore 43 onto the bottom of the well (column 5, lines 7-10).

Wallace does not specify the materials from which the drill string 6 and the tool 12 are made, but as noted in the Office Action, the drill string 6 is cross-hatched for metal. In fact, all of the components of the drill string 6 and the tool 12 are cross-hatched for metal, except for the drive collar 52, which is cross-hatched for rubber and is explicitly stated to made of rubber (column 4, line 3).

As is clear from Wallace's specification and drawings, the transmission of torque between the drill string 6 and the tool 12 is achieved through the mating spline members, all of which are cross-hatched for metal; and the rubber seal 62 serves no function other than as a seal. The rubber seal 62 certainly is not a Kelly rod, as asserted on page 3 of the Office Action (first paragraph).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the invention as recited in amended claim 1 and in the claims depending therefrom is not anticipated by Wallace, and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections have been complied with, properly traversed, or rendered moot. Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should any questions arise,

the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance.

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: November 9, 2005

By: 

Allen S. Melser
Registration No. 27,215

Customer No. 00,136
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 638-6666